

PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-P

PC-P1

From: janine@paradiseroadcarcare.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 6:39 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

If a braided on and off ramp is put in at magnolia/Warner northbound side I intend on gathering all residence located on Daisy avenue to sue for loss of property value and quality of life. So many residences here on Daisy avenue are original owners, I myself have lived here for 22 years. This proposed change will severely affect our property values and our quality of life. This house is my retirement and I have worked so hard to hold on to it. I would be devastated. My privacy in my own home taken away. All previous proposals I have read have only mentioned a lane addition. This is not a commercial area where the impact is not as great, these are private homes owned by individuals and infringes on our privacy and severely affects us financially. Please reconsider!

Janine Parker
16863 Daisy Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA. 92708

Sent from my iPhone

1

PC-P2

From: Janine [j9parker@socal.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 5:35 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Fw: I-405 Comment Deadline is August 12

I strongly object to the plans for the Magnolia/Warner Northbound braided on-ramp, I see no mention of the impact or visuals for the homes that are located on Daisy Avenue in the EIR. I walked my neighborhood last night after hearing from Christina Byrne and everyone I talked to had no idea that this was what was chosen. The EIR only talks about the business on the southbound side. I asked for specifics and was told that the top of the braided on ramp behind my property will be 1 ft above my existing retaining wall, 36 feet from my property line. I was told that there would be no additional noise, no mention of my privacy be taken away, cars will be able to see directly into my back yard and into my living room. This will severely affect my property value, my health, my privacy. Are you able to have a backyard BBQ? Well I wont be without having thousands of people driving by.

Our neighborhood has been ignored, excluded and not informed and we are affected most. That you can see from the EIR, they even dismissed us! I looked and at no other point in our area is this one in a residential area, commercial I can understand people only visit for an hour or two. This is our home, my kids were born and grew up here. This is my biggest source for retirement and you are taking that investment away. I am going to encourage my neighborhood to hire an attorney to save us from you, you who are supposed to be improving our community but in fact you are taking it away.

As I told Christina, If you are doing a project it is your responsibility as a business person with integrity to make sure you if your improvements are going to directly impact a homeowner, you should contact them personally not just bury it in a document in the hopes that you will get the path of least resistance. I'm disgusted, upset and angry, all at the same time. If you knew how hard I worked to keep this house for my kids, all by myself you would understand. There is always someone there to knock you right back down.

I have asked Christina if she could arrange a community meeting with my neighborhood, you and OCTA to actually communicate with us so you can hear our feedback, questions and concerns. Maybe you could actually show us visuals instead of engineered drawings that unless we are architects we would not understand.

Janine Parker
16863 Daisy Avenue
Fountain Valley
714-642-3153

1

PC-P3

From: WILLIAM PETKUS [wpetkus@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:55 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: I405

I oppose toll lanes on the San Diego Freeway. } 1

PC-P4

From: Christian Porras [christianporras999@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 12:31 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Comments to the I-405 Supplemental EIR/EIS
Attachments: Supplem EIR questions toSmita Deshpande . 07 17 2013.docx

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief
Caltrans-District 12
"Attn: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

PC-P4 (Continued)

I-405 Improvement Project. SUPPLEMENT DRAF EIR/EIS . MY WRITTEN COMMENTS
07.18.2013

<u>Chapter 2: Purpose and Need/Project Description</u>	<u>Questions</u>	<u>Responses</u>
<u>Page 2-1</u>	Need for the Project Page 2-1. Under 2.2 Why does the I-405 have a limitation in detecting traffic incidents and providing rapid response and clearance due to lack of capacity and technological infrastructure? Why lack of capacity has anything to do with detecting traffic incidents? What is technology infrastructure?	} 1 } 2
<u>Page 2-2:</u>	Project Description - see 10th paragraph It reads "the project limits extend 0.2 miles south of Bristol Street (I2-ORA-405PM 9.3) What I2 stand for? North of I-805 (0.7-LA-405PM1.2) What 07 stand for? Beach Blvd. undercrossing (I2-ORA-22-PM R3.8) What R 3.8 stands for? I can be concluded that the writing of the EIR careless about the lay man who do not easy understand this terminology conclusion: lack of environmental justice. Is this correct?	} 3 } 4
<u>Page 2-3:</u>	After twelfth paragraph It refers to the no build alternative and three build alternatives: Alternative 1: Add on lane in each direction Alternative 2: Add two lanes in each direction Alternative 3: Express (Toll Road) and add on GP lane in each direction Questions: If the OCTA Board of Commission already approved the implementation of alternative 1 in the 2012, eliminating alternative 2 and 3 1. Why to insist in considering again alternative 2 and 3? 2. It has been proved again and again that toll roads are a burden to the tax payers Only the toll road concessionaries and bond sellers are beneficiaries of toll roads facilities, why to implement a toll road as alternative (3). The toll revenues do not amortize the constructing and operating a toll road. Examples of toll road facilities. Refer to a report prepared the state treasure Bill Lockyer. A toll road operator in Orange County, The Foot Hill, and Eastern Corridor Agency is at risk of defaulting on its payment, if it does not refinance more than 2 billion of outstanding debt. Toll collections are expensive and collections have not been as expected. There are cases of default in other state such as Virginia (Dulles Greenway), South Carolina (Southern Connector), Indiana Why to insist in a toll road construction in the I 405? Last Sentence: Describe the EAOJ440K Project as a separate project. The fact that projects are not integrated at once, causes impact to the communities year after year, communities such as those along the I-405 (Huntington Beach, Westminster, Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Rose more, Long Beach are sick and tired of continuous disruptions, unhealthy conditions, pollutants, noises, detrimental to business	} 5 } 6 } 7

PC-P4 (Continued)

<p>Page 2-4:</p>	<p>Assuming that Alternative 2 is still under consideration The fact that adds two GP in each direction of I-405</p> <p>Question: Does the implementation of Alt 2 implies to tear down an existing sound wall located at the I-405 Northbound Right ROW at Almond St. in the community of College Park East, City of Seal Beach?</p> <p>If this is the case, can a design exception be requested for avoiding tearing down the sound wall?</p> <p>Have you taken into consideration the fact that the relocation of the sound wall will result in severe impacts to the community of College Park East, Seal Beach. If this is the case the City of Seal Beach will sue the agencies for requesting stopping the relocation of this sound wall causing delays on these projects</p> <p>Should Almond St. sound wall is relocated the existing 32 feet street ROW, will the narrowed to 22 feet. Correct? Where the EIR addresses the lack of parking for the cull de sac streets neighbors facing Almont St. during sweeping day, the parking of emergency vehicles (fire trucks etc.)?</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>Page 2-6:</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Explain the HOV2S and HOV3+. What 2 and 3 stand for?</p> <p>Explain the following: What R0.7 and R3.8 stands for in SR-22? What R27.8 I2-R and R1.6 stands for in I2-ORA-73 & 605?</p>	<p>9</p>
<p>Page 2-7:</p>	<p>14th paragraph Why to add an auxiliary lane between Seal Beach Blvd. on ramp and the SR-22/7th street off ramp considering the fact that this ramp has just been completed?</p> <p>25th paragraph Why this sentence only highlights the advantage of the toll road but it does not address the extra cost of cost 300 million dollar with respect to alternative 1?</p>	<p>10</p> <p>11</p>
<p>Page 2-10: Page 2-8:</p>	<p>Construction Stage Paragraph 12. It lists the improvement which are being taken place (under construction) anticipated to be completed in 2015</p> <p>Also it states that any of the alternatives 1, 2, & 3 are expected to start construction in 2015</p> <p>Community of College Park East, Seal Beach is experiencing 2 years plus 2 more years of traffic description noises, unhealthy pollutants from the piles driving machines, heavy earth moving equipment.</p> <p>Should alternatives 2 and 3 are implemented. They will be completed in 2020, meaning that the community of College Park East Seal Beach will experience 7 more years of construction. This is just a non environmental justice. Correct?</p> <p>The letter from David Rose man City of Long Beach City Engineer and Consultants state that their own studies traffic impacts exceeds the level of service of those obtained in the EIR by OCTA/CALTRANS. Is this correct?</p>	<p>12</p> <p>13</p>

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-P

Response to Comment Letter PC-P1

Comment PC-P1-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Property Values.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P2

Comment PC-P2-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange, Property Values, Noise/Noise Analysis.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P3

Comment PC-P3-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-P4

Comment PC-P4-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

The older technological infrastructure results in a longer lead time before incidents are detected and the appropriate emergency aid dispatched. For example, newer technology can provide computer-assisted identification of potential incidents based on changes in vehicle flow and speed. A small reduction in response time can have a substantially greater reduction in the time it takes to clear the incident and restore the freeway to full operations. The I-405 corridor lacks some of the field infrastructure to provide this type of quick response.

The lack of capacity inhibits the ability of emergency vehicles to access the emergency site quickly. When traffic is heavily congested during peak hours, the response time of emergency vehicles to the site of an incident increases. An increase of a few minutes in the arrival of emergency vehicles at the site of an incident can result in a substantially longer increase in the period during which freeway operations are impacted as traffic congestion increases upstream of the site of the incident. Lack of shoulders on both sides of the freeway also inhibits the ability of emergency vehicles to access the site of an incident. Lack of a left-side shoulder along much of I-405 requires that vehicles involved in an incident in a left lane be cleared to the right shoulder, disrupting operations in those lanes.

Comment PC-P4-2

The lack of capacity does not affect the detection of traffic incidents. The older technological infrastructure results in a longer lead time before incidents are detected and the appropriate emergency aid dispatched. Technological infrastructure includes loops used for speed and volume detection, closed-circuit television, variable message signs, ramp metering equipment, and real-time traveler information about freeway conditions. Please also see Response to Comment PC-P4-1.

Comment PC-P4-3

The text referenced in the comment provides the post mile limits of the proposed project. Standard Caltrans notation for identifying locations along state highways is based on the post mile system. The opening number in the notation indicates the Caltrans District in which the

location is found. After the opening number identifying the Caltrans District, a set of letters identifies the county in which the location is found followed by the number of the highway. The number of the highway is followed by the letters “PM”, which is the abbreviation for “post mile”. The number following the letters “PM” is the mileage from the start of the highway in the county. For north/south highways, post miles are measured from south to north; for east/west highways, post miles are measured from west to east. An “R” in front of a post mile value indicates that the post mile has been revised, usually as the result of a project that changes the length of the highway.

The “12” in the post mile notation referenced in the comment refers to Caltrans District 12, in which most of the proposed project is located. The “07” in another post mile notation referenced in the comment refers to Caltrans District 7, which includes Los Angeles County; some improvements proposed under Alternative 3 extend into Los Angeles County. The letters “ORA” and “LA” refer to Orange and Los Angeles counties, respectively. The numbers “405,” “605,” and “22” refer to I-405, I-605, and SR-22, respectively. The “R3.8” identifies the location on SR-22 that is 3.8 miles east of the point at which SR-22 enters Orange County (at the San Gabriel River) plus the distance where I-405 and SR-22 overlap. The post mile designations along SR-22 are suspended (i.e., do not count) in the section where I-405 and SR-22 overlap; the overlap section uses I-405 post miles.

Comment PC-P4-4

The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS provides technical information about the proposed project that requires use of some technical terminology. However, the document was prepared to provide technical information in a way that can be understood by a lay audience. For example, in the case of the post miles on page 2-2 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS referenced in the comment, the post miles are described both in technical and lay terms. The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS on page 2-2 states that “[t]he project limits extend from 0.2-mile south of Bristol Street (12-ORA-405 Post Mile [PM] 9.3) to the Orange County/Los Angeles county line (12-ORA-405 PM 24.2)” This description provides the project limits in terms of both the technical post mile limits and a more lay description referencing commonly known locations such as the county line and Bristol Street.

The use of technical language in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS or the Draft EIR/EIS by itself is not an environmental justice issue. Environmental justice is covered in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.1.4.3, which concludes that “No minority or low-income populations that would be adversely affected by the proposed project have been identified....”.

Comment PC-P4-5

The OCTA Board of Directors is not solely responsible for identification of the Preferred Alternative (the alternative to be implemented). For a description of the process followed in selecting the Preferred Alternative, please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-P4-6

The potential benefits of Alternative 3 are fully covered in the Draft EIR/EIS. Although there has been extensive media coverage of the potential for the San Joaquin Toll Road (SR-73) to default, a default has not happened. Alternative 3 is not a toll road, but it includes tolled lanes, as well as free general purpose lanes.

Comment PC-P4-7

Project EA 0J440K would cause little impact to the communities. It would consist principally of changing the striping on the freeway.

Comment PC-P4-8

For a description of the potential impacts of the proposed project on the Almond Avenue soundwall, please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-P4-9

A glossary of terms is provided in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS on page v. HOV2 refers to a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) with two occupants; HOV3+ refers to an HOV with three or more occupants.

The text referenced in the comment (“R0.7 and R3.8”) provides the post mile limits of the proposed project. See Response to Comment PC-P4-3.

Comment PC-P4-10

The distance between the Seal Beach Boulevard on-ramp and the SR-22/7th Street branch connector is short and would be improved with an auxiliary lane in Alternatives 1 and 3.

Comment PC-P4-11

Page 2-7 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS provides a description of Alternative 3. Project costs are presented in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 1-18.

Comment PC-P4-12

Page 2-10 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS indicates that the construction durations would be 48 months for Alternative 1, 51 months for Alternative 2, and 54 months for Alternative 3. If construction starts in 2015, it would be complete in 2019 or 2020, depending on the alternative. Duration of construction by itself is not an environmental justice issue unless it disproportionately and adversely affects protected populations. Environmental justice is covered in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.1.4.3, which concludes that “No minority or low-income populations that would be adversely affected by the proposed project have been identified....”

Comment PC-P4-13

The Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS provides accurate and complete information about the potential adverse effects and significant impacts to traffic anticipated to result from the proposed improvements to I-405. A letter from Mr. David Roseman, City of Long Beach Traffic Engineer, in response to circulation of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, is included in Appendix R2 as Comment GL2. A letter from Mr. Roseman in response to circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS is included in Appendix R1 as Comment GL11; another letter from Mr. Roseman is an attachment to comments submitted by Mr. Mike Conway, Director of Public Works, City of Long Beach and is included in Appendix R1 as part of Comment GL12.